UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,568	10/27/2003	Stephen Michael Hartley	858-011568-US(PAR)	3544

2512 7590 01/09/2008

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER	
SALOMON, PHENUEL S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/694,568	HARTLEY, STEPHEN MICHAEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phenuel S. Salomon	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 December 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-24,26-38,40-43,45-58 and 61-63* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-24,26-38,40-43,45-58 and 61-63* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment file on December 20, 2007.

2. Claims 1, 15, 29, 43 and 47 are amended; claims 11, 25, 39, 44, 59, and 60 are cancelled, and claims 1-10, 12-24, 26-38, 40-43, 45-58, and 61- 63 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 9, 12, 14-15, 17, 23, 26, 28-29, 31, 37, 40, 42-43, 46, 48, 54, 56, 58, and 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meppelink et al. (US 5,542,069) in view of Sullivan (US 5,737,557).

Claims 1, 15, 29 and 43: Meppelink discloses a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program for determining a view route comprising at least one view and passing said view route to a view router from said first application (col. 4, lines 39-50), automatically by said view router (col. 4, lines 49-50) [the router routes real I/O messages which is done automatically] but does not disclose launching at least one view based on said view route and continuing said first application when at least part of said view route has been processed. However, Sullivan discloses a plurality of buttons, which correspond to

individual software suite when select one of the access buttons open or launch the corresponding software (col. 5, lines 25 -45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include view launcher in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to define dynamically new view routes while application is being executed.

Claims 3, 17,31 and 48: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 1, 15, 29 and 43 above, and Sullivan further discloses a plurality of icons which consist of views and information about the second application (col. 5, lines 50-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to list the available resources in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to conveniently make a user aware of the available resources.

Claims 9, 23, 37 and 54: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 15, 29 and 43 above, and Sullivan further discloses a graphical display element with a plurality of displayed icons (fig 1a &b). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include graphical display elements in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate access to resources regarding the various application programs.

Claims 12, 26, 40 and 56: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 1, 15, 29 and 43 above, but do not explicitly disclose "at least part of said view route is specified in the memory of said electronic device". However, Meppelink does disclose a memory (fig. 1). [it is old and well known within the computing arts in order to run a program/code a portion of the memory is allocated to that particular program]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to specify the memory area or location of the view route. One would have been motivated to do so in order to correctly determine the view route.

Claims 14, 28, 42 and 58: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 1, 15, 29 and 43 above, and Meppelink further discloses that the said view route is determined based on user actions (col. 3, lines 33-41).

Claim 46: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a computer program as in claim 43 above, Meppelink further discloses that the computer readable medium is a magnetic or optical disk (fig. 1, item 18).

Claim 61: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a computer program as in claim 43 above, Meppelink further discloses that the view router is implemented as a library (fig. 1, item 18).

Claim 62: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a computer program as in claim 43 above, Meppelink further discloses that the view router is implemented as an own application (col. 2, lines 24-40).

Claim 63. Meppelink discloses an electronic device, comprising:

a first application (modules), said first application configured to determine a view route comprising at least one view (col. 4, lines 39-50) [I/O constitute a plurality of views or windows];

a second application (modules) comprising said at least one view (col. 4, lines 39-50) [I/O constitute a plurality of views or windows]; and

a view router configured to process said view route (col. 4, lines 39-50), but does explicitly disclose to automatically launch at least one view based on said view route and to continue said first application

when at least part of said view route has been processed. However, Sullivan discloses a launching a financial software suite with a plurality of buttons, which correspond to individual software suite when select one of the access buttons open or launch the corresponding software (col. 5, lines 25 -45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include view launcher in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate the user interaction with the device features even while application is being executed.

5. Claims 2, 4-8, 10,13, 16, 18-22, 24, 27, 30, 32-36, 38, 41, 45, 47, 49-50, 51-53, 55, 57, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meppelink et al. (US 5,54,069) in view of Sullivan (5,737,557) and in further view of Bahrs (7,181,686 B1).

Claims 2, 16, 30 and 47: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 1, 15, 29 and 43 above, but do not explicitly disclose "gathering data from said at least one view; and pass said data from said view router to said first application or to a subsequent application in said view route". However, Bahrs discloses a data collection method from user and processing such data (col 4, lines 20 -30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include data collection in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to simulate user actions in a reliable manner.

Claim 4, 18, 32 and 49: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 2, 16, 30 and 47 above, but do not explicitly disclose "data is organized into a journal list comprising an entry for each view in said view route". Bahrs discloses diagrams that illustrate variables and method in view controller (col. 19, lines 1-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to organize data into a

journal list in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate the user interaction with different views.

Claims 5, 19, 33 and 50: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 2, 16, 30 and 47 above, but do not explicitly disclose "data is organized into a list of type and value pairs". However, Bahrs discloses how view controller handles data that uses key-value pair data model (col. 48, lines 37-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to organize data in value pairs in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to dynamically refresh or change the view display.

Claims 6, 20, 34 and 51: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 5, 19, 33 and 50 above, but do not explicitly disclose "data type and value pair are in a markup language format. However, Bahrs discloses how the value pair could be XML type data (col.48, lines 37-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to present data as markup language in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to dynamically refresh or change the view display.

Claims 7, 21, 35 and 52: Meppelink, Sullivan and Bahrs disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 2, 16, 30 and 47 above, and Sullivan further discloses that the said view router provides a generic interface with generic methods and acts as an adapter for returning data from said at least one view launched to said first application or a subsequent application in said view chain (col. 5, lines 25-49) (Examiner note: It's inherent that closing the view of an application will automatically return all the data from the view to the said application). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this feature in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to have a faster data processing system.

Claims 8, 22, 36 and 53: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 1, 15, 29 and 43 above, but do not explicitly disclose 'said electronic device has a graphical user interface". However, Bahrs discloses an electronic device with user-generated data (col. 14, lines 1-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include graphical user interface in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to maintain and facilitate access to contextual information regarding the various application programs or files stored on the device.

Claim 10, 24, 38, and 55: Meppelink, Sullivan and Bahrs disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 8, 22, and 29 above, and Sullivan further discloses software suite window while execution begins (col. 8, lines 66-67 and col. 9, lines 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include window display in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate the normal operation of the device by the user.

Claims 13, 27, 41 and 57: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a method, system, an electronic device and a computer program as in claims 12, 26, 29 and 56 above, but do not explicitly disclose 'said view route is updated based on user actions'. However, Bahrs discloses a user input is received at a container handled by a view controller, wherein the user input requests a change in permissions..." (col. 3, lines 61-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to dynamically update view route based on user action. One would have been motivated to do so in order to have a user-friendly device.

Claim 45: Meppelink and Sullivan disclose a computer program as in claims 43 above according to claim 43, but do not explicitly disclose said computer readable medium is a removable memory card. However, Bahrs discloses a floppy disc as a type of removable readable medium (col.66, lines 30-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a removable medium in Meppelink. One would have been motivated to do so in order to be more flexible in term of usage.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claim 1, applicant argues:

a). Meppelink fails to disclose or suggest "determining a view route comprising at least one view".

In response, examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that Meppelink discloses this feature at (col. 4, lines 39-50) "the router 62 also routes real I/O messages between stream modules 48 and the window server 32". By routing I/O messages, there are views or windows associated with that particular method.

b) Sullivan fails to disclose what the first application to be continued would be, or how the continuing of an application is associated with the processing of at least part of a view route. Sullivan does not disclose that an application is continued when the list of files is presented as symbols such as illustrated in Figure IB in Sullivan.

In response to the above applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "what the first application to be continued would be, or how the continuing of an application is associated with the processing of at least part of a view route. Sullivan does not disclose that an application is continued when the list of files is presented as symbols such as illustrated in Figure IB in Sullivan.") are not recited in the rejected claims 1, 15, 29, 43, and 63. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response, examiner further notes that Sullivan discloses "each of the icons represent an item comprising the software suite" (col. 5, lines 50-67). Each one of the software within that suite contains a plurality of views or windows that need to be processed while being displayed to the user.

c). Applicant argues: Sullivan fails to disclose "anything corresponding to a command script in the sense taught by Meppelink"

Examiner notes that the limitation "anything corresponding to a command script in the sense taught by Meppelink" is not recited in the rejected claims 1, 15, 29, 43, and 63.

d). Applicant further argues: Bahrs fails to disclose or suggest "gathering data from said at least one view; and passing said data from said view router to said first application or to a subsequent application in said view route."

In response, examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that Bahrs clearly discloses "data is collected from an interface where an event is sent to a first application mediator and to a second application" (col. 4, lines 20-30).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Brendle (US 2003/0222919 A1) discloses displaying views on computer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phenuel S. Salomon whose telephone number is (571) 270-1699. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.(Alternate Friday Off) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272 4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PSS
1/03/2008

Stephen Hong
Supervisory Primary Examiner